STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

GIR 1

TO : MR. A. H. BELMONT

DATE: January 29, 1957

FROM : MR. R. R. ROACH

Tolson
Nichols
Boardman
Belmont
Mason
Mohr
Parsons
Rosen
Tamm
Nease
Winterrowd
Tele. Room
Holloman
Gandy

SUBJECT: ROBERT AMORY
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Amory has been Deputy Director in charge of Current Intelligence at CIA for the past 3-4 years. In this capacity he has played a key role in the preparation of intelligence estimates. He works closely with the National Security Council. He has never been considered as being friendly toward the Bureau.

Enclosed herewith are two copies of a report of proceedings covering a hearing held by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee dated January 18, 1957. The report covers the questioning of Roger Moore, described as a Boston lawyer. He was questioned by the Committee concerning his knowledge of a meeting held at Harvard University in the Fall of 1955, on which occasion Amory apparently made a speech. The report indicates that Amory spoke to a group which included the professors and undergraduates concerning the functions of CIA in the formulation of national security policy. It is reflected that after his scheduled speech, Amory spoke to the group concerning the subject of U.S. acceptance of the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Moore is quoted as stating that Amory defended the proposition that Red China should be admitted into the UN.

From time to time we have seen evidence of CIA's influence in the formulation of US foreign policy. In connection with this particular matter it is believed that the above information concerning Amory merits recording for possible future reference. It should be noted that the information set forth in the enclosed documents is not to be disseminated outside of the Bureau.

ACTION:

None. For information.

Enclosures (2)
SJP:bal
(7)
1 - Mr. Nichols
1 - Mr. Belmont
1 - Liaison Section
1 - Mr. Kuhrtz
1 - Mr. Short
1 - Mr. Papich

INDEXED - 37
RECORDED - 37

62-80750-2933

16 FEB 20 1957

58 FEB 27 1957

LIAISON

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED DATE 7-20-98 BY SP2 AM/LEV/L Per OGA, #36892

Vol. 75

The United States Senate

Report of Proceedings

DO NOT DISSEMINATE

Hearing held before

Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, of the Committee on the Judiciary

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

DECLASSIFIED BY SP 2 AL-M/EHL
ON 7-20-98
Per DGA #368692

EXECUTIVE - ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

January 18, 1957

Washington, D. C.

DO NOT DISSEMINATE

WARD & PAUL
1760 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

NATIONAL 8-4266
8-4267
8-4268
8-4269

62-80750-2933

ENCLOSURE

C O N T E N T S

TESTIMONY OF	PAGE
Roger Moore, 26 West Cedar Street, Boston, Massachusetts	1744

EXECUTIVE - ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

- - -

"DO NOT DISSEMINATE"

Friday, January 18, 1957

United States Senate,
Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration
of the Internal Security Act and Other
Internal Security Laws, of the
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 4:35 o'clock p.m., in Senator Olin D. Johnston's office, Senate Office Building.

Present: Senator Johnston (presiding).

Also present: Robert Morris, Chief Counsel, and William A. Rusher, Associate Counsel.

- - -

Senator Johnston. Do you solemnly swear that the evidence you will give before this Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Moore. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ROGER MOORE

Mr. Rusher. Would you give your name, please?

Mr. Moore. Roger Moore.

ao 2

Mr. Rusher. And what is your address?

Mr. Moore. 26 West Cedar Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Mr. Rusher. And what is your occupation?

Mr. Moore. Lawyer.

Mr. Rusher. Are you a member of the Boston law firm of Ropes, Gray, Best, Coolidge & Rugge?

Mr. Moore. That is correct.

Mr. Rusher. Were you at Harvard as a student, at one of the Graduate Schools in the fall of 1955?

Mr. Moore. I was.

Mr. Rusher. Did you participate in meetings at which Robert Amory of the Central Intelligence Agency was present?

Mr. Moore. I did.

Mr. Rusher. Will you tell us very briefly the general circumstances of that meeting?

Mr. Moore. Yes.

That was the occasion of a joint seminar held in conjunction with the Harvard Law School in the Littauer Graduate Center, at which former Professor Amory had come to speak.

Mr. Rusher. And after the speech what happened next?

Mr. Moore. There was a dinner at the Harvard Faculty Club for a number of students and professors who were interested in what Mr. Amory had to say in seminars before which he spoke.

Mr. Rusher. And what followed the dinner?

Mr. Moore. After that dinner there was a general round table discussion held in the Faculty Club, generally to honor Professor Amory and to discuss with him whatever he thought might be of interest.

Mr. Rusher. You say he was a former professor of Harvard?

Mr. Moore. Harvard Law School; that is correct.

Mr. Rusher. And he was back, although at the time he was in the CIA?

Mr. Moore. Yes; he was Deputy Director.

The topic of the address earlier in the afternoon, as I recall, as the function of the Central Intelligence Agency in the formation of national security policy.

Mr. Rusher. I think, Senator, that Mr. Amory is still, if I am not mistaken, one of the top three or four men in the Central Intelligence Agency.

Now, Mr. Moore, will you tell us as briefly as you can the events at the outset of that meeting, following the dinner, the round table -- how many were present and what type of people?

Mr. Moore. Oh, from ten to fifteen people, I would say, most of them were professors, and maybe one-third or one-half were students in the Graduate School there.

Mr. Rusher. And you were there?

Mr. Moore. Yes.

Mr. Rusher. What was said?

Mr. Moore. Just after the dinner was concluded and the table was cleared away, one of the senior professors present asked Professor Amory whether he would like to suggest he go to questions on the general topic about which he spoke earlier in the afternoon, or would he like to throw out a new topic for discussion, and at that time Professor Amory said he thought he would like to throw out a new topic, and then he was given leave to announce what the topic would be and his remark, as near as I can recall, was:

"I think I should like to discuss with you what I consider to be one of the most important problems before the Government of the United States today, which is acceptance on the part of the people of the United States to the admission of Red China to the United Nations."

Mr. Rusher. As nearly as you can recall, those were his words; is that correct?

Mr. Moore. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Rusher. Although perhaps not exactly verbatim?

Mr. Moore. Well, certainly I could not say it was precisely verbatim.

At this time I do recall, however, that he was immediately caught up by one of the members of the group on the general premise -- however, it was stated as a "how" rather than "should" question.

Mr. Rusher. How we can secure this acceptance, rather

than should we accept it; is that right?

Mr. Moore. Yes, that is correct.

I do remember another member of the group, whose name escapes me at the moment, did mention that he thought that it might be a good idea, something similar to the campaign in 1948 with Harry Truman, to take an unpopular question, might very well present the question if the opinion of the country were against it, and therefore that might be the way, just to adopt that as a campaign policy and take it to the people.

Mr. Rusher. Let me see if I understand it. Somebody suggested that it might be a good idea to argue it in the forthcoming campaign of 1956 on the part of one Party or the other for the admission of Red China, on the ground that while it was unpopular, that nevertheless it was sometimes successful campaigning to take the so-called unpopular side of the issues; is that right?

Mr. Moore. That is right.

Mr. Rusher. And did Professor Amory and the others then proceed to discuss this general subject?

Mr. Moore. Yes; there was prolonged discussion.

Mr. Rusher. How long?

Mr. Moore. I would say maybe two and a half hours.

Mr. Rusher. Did Professor Amory defend the proposition we should try to get this acceptance?

Mr. Moore. Yes, he did. We explored various possibilities.

He did concede, I think, that as an interim measure it would probably be necessary to have two Chinas in the United Nations, and that possibly that was the happiest interim solution of the problem.

Mr. Rusher. And ultimately the goal was to be the acceptance of the mainland government of China as the official United Nations members?

Mr. Moore. As far as I can recall, that is correct.

Mr. Rusher. I have no further questions.

Senator Johnston. No questions.

(Whereupon, at 4:40 o'clock p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

- - -